

# The Gazette of India



## EXTRAORDINARY

### PART II—Section 3

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 112] NEW DELHI, FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 1952

#### MINISTRY OF LABOUR

#### NOTIFICATION

*New Delhi, the 23rd July, 1952*

**S.R.O. 1350.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following awards of the All India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes) in the matter of victimisation etc. of workmen in banking companies.

#### AWARDS

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri S. P. Sathappan

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No 242. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal."

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write

to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES).  
BOMBAY

Shri B. Ongarvelu

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 243. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal."

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES).  
BOMBAY

Shri J. N. James

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952.

It appears there as Serial No. 244. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal."

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

**BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY**

Shri C. Ranganathan

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 245. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal."

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherin the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri E. C. Chitty Babu

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 246. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal."

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherin the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri C. Kanniappan

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 247. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY:

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri V. Ramaswamy

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 248. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri S. Natarajan

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 249. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri B. A. Jagannathan

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 250. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June 1952

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri P. Authikesavalu

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 251. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the

same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SAstry, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri K. Somanathan

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 252. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:—

"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is

no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri N. A. R. K. Arunachalam

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 253. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:-

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri D. Stanley

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952.

It appears there as Serial No. 254. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherin the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

**BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY**

Shri E. D. Jeyapalan

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 256. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri M. R. Madhan

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 257. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri S. V. Govindarajulu

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 258. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd) S. PANCHAPACESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri N. V. Rangaswamy

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 259. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of

the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri T. R. Thyagarajan

versus

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 260. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication therof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars therof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri K. Elumali

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 261. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri R. B. D. Lakshman

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 262. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri G. Jagannathan

versus

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 263. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal, in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAYShri P. Veeraswamy  
*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 264. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

## "STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAYShri W. Nagappan  
*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 265. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

## "STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the

same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri M. Ramaswamy

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 266. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that

the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri C. Kuppuswamy

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 267. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri P. Varadarajan

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952.

It appears there as Serial No. 268. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows.

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

**BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY**

Shri D. Kannan

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 269. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 18th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri M. P. Kuppuswamy

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 270. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 18th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri P. Kuppuswamy

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 271. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri P. Perumal

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 272. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workmen within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri N. Kadhirvelu

*Versus*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 273. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF INCREMENT"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

There are several such cases of alleged disputes between the Indian Overseas Bank and its workmen wherein the dispute is stated to be "Stoppage of increment". As in none of these cases the workmen concerned sent a reply to the notice sent to them individually in terms aforesaid, the Tribunal thought it desirable to write to the Bank to ask the individuals concerned to write to this Tribunal and inform them that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. In accordance with this, letters have been received from most of these workmen of the Bank that there is no outstanding dispute and that there is nothing to be adjudicated upon by the Tribunal. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY(Serial No. 133 in the Schedule to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour  
Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952)

Shri Gopinath Roy

Versus

Imperial Bank of India

This dispute between Shri Gopinath Roy and the Imperial Bank of India has been referred to this Tribunal for adjudication by the Government of India Notification, Ministry of Labour No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. This particular item appears as Serial No. 133 in the schedule thereto. The nature of the dispute is put down as "Suspension from service".

Notice was sent by registered post to Shri Gopinath Roy. Though served he has not sent a reply nor has he filed any statement of his case before this Tribunal. This case was taken up to-day at Bombay. Mr. Blair appears for the Imperial Bank of India.

It is stated that the suspension order has been withdrawn already. In these circumstances no order appears to be necessary. Our award, therefore, is that no orders are necessary.

S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

M. L. TANNAN, Member.

V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 27th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY(Serial No. 135 in the Schedule to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour  
Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952)

Shri Panchkauri

Versus

Imperial Bank of India

This dispute between Shri Panchkauri and the Imperial Bank of India has been referred to this Tribunal for adjudication by the Government of India Notification, Ministry of Labour No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there in the schedule as Serial No. 135. The nature of the dispute is put down as "Forced working of overtime".

The workman does not appear. Mr. A. E. Blair appears for the Bank. Notwithstanding a notice calling upon the workman to file before this Tribunal a statement of his case, which was served on him by registered post, no statement of his case has been received. In the circumstances we must take it that this dispute is not pressed before us. We pass an award that no orders are necessary.

S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

M. L. TANNAN, Member.

V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 27th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY(Serial No. 154 in the Schedule to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour  
Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952)

Shri T. S. Phoola

Versus

Imperial Bank of India

This dispute between Shri T. S. Phoola and the Imperial Bank of India has been referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears in the

schedule thereto as Serial No. 154. The nature of the dispute is set down as "Termination of service".

Although notice was sent by registered post to the workman concerned, that he should file a statement of his case with particulars thereof before the 29th February 1952, no such statement has been filed. The notice sent from this office appears to have been duly served on the party as a postal acknowledgment with a thumb impression has been received back in evidence of service. Although some months have expired, even till now, no statement from the party asking for adjudication of his dispute and giving particulars thereof has been received. Nor does it appear that the Imperial Bank of India received any copy of any statement of the party in relation to the alleged dispute. Today when this matter was set down "to be spoken to" and was taken up it was represented to us by an official of the Imperial Bank of India Employees' Association, Calcutta, that if further time is given the Association would enquire into the matter and take steps to bring up the dispute in proper form for adjudication before this Tribunal. It was further stated that the last communication from the workman to the Association was a year ago, sometimes in June 1951. Since they have had no contact with the workman at all. In these circumstances we feel that it will not be proper to keep the case undisposed on our file still, merely because the Association might be in a position to give life to an old dispute, which the party itself has not chosen to agitate before us.

In these circumstances, we are of opinion that there is no dispute to be adjudicated upon. We pass an award accordingly that no orders are necessary.

S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

M. L. TANNAN, Member.

V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 27th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
AT LUCKNOW

Shri Hem Chandra Pant

*Versus*

The Hindustan Commercial Bank Ltd.

*For the workman*

Shri A. C. Kaker, General Secretary of the U.P. Bank Employees' Union, Kanpur.

*For the Bank*

Shri K. N. Bhatnagar, Establishment Superintendent of the Bank.

This dispute between Shri Hem Chandra Pant and the Hindustan Commercial Bank Ltd. has been referred to this Tribunal for adjudication, by Notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, S.R.O. No. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears in that schedule as No. 342. The nature of the dispute is stated to be "Termination of Service". After due notice to the parties this case was heard by this Tribunal at Lucknow on 5th April 1952. Shri Hem Chandra Pant was present in person and was represented by Shri A. C. Kakar, General Secretary of the U. P. Bank Employees' Union. The Bank was represented by Shri K. N. Bhatnagar, its Establishment Superintendent. The following facts were admitted by the parties :—

Shri Hem Chandra Pant entered service as a clerk on 1st July 1946 on a salary of Rs. 72/- in the scale of Rs. 72-6-90. He was working in the Bank's Nainital Branch. In September 1947 he became the Secretary of the U. P. Bank Employees' Union, Nainital Branch. On 20th March 1948 he received a letter from the Bank in which it was stated, "We are sorry to inform you that you have voluntarily ceased to be on our pay role since the 29th January 1948 because from that day you absented yourself from duty without any intimation to us. You are therefore not in our employment from date." His case against the Bank was referred by the Central Government to the All India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes) presided over by Mr. Justice K. C. Sen. The Bank defended its action on the ground that he absented himself from duty from 29th January 1948 without any leave application. The Sen Tribunal held that the Bank had not made out a case for justifying his dismissal because the only ground on which his services were terminated was that he had voluntarily ceased to be on the pay role since 29th January 1948, he having absented himself from duty without

any intimation. This allegation of the Bank was found to be contrary to records and incorrect. The Sen Tribunal therefore passed an award that "Shri Hem Chandra Pant should be re-instated with effect from 20th March 1948 and he should be paid his salary and allowances for 6 months from the said date, treating the rest of the period upto the date of the publication of the award as leave without pay." In pursuance of this order the Bank asked him to report himself for duty at the Head Office of the Bank and he accordingly joined duty there on 4th October 1950. On 14th November 1950, however, in less than 2 months from the date of his resuming duty he received another communication which read as follows:—"The services of Mr. Hem Chandra Pant, a clerk at Head Office are surplus to the requirements of the Bank and they should therefore be terminated with effect from that date". A pay order for Rs. 386-6-6 was enclosed. He received it under protest reserving all his legal rights.

The present complaint of Shri Hem Chandra Pant is that though he was reinstated as per the award of the previous Tribunal, the Bank continued to harass him in many ways. According to his complaint no proper duties were allotted to him. He was forced to be idle from 10 A.M. to 5 P.M. with absolutely no work and not even proper seating arrangements. His case is that the salary for October 1950 was not paid and it was only on a complaint by him to the Labour Inspector and at the latter's instance the Bank paid his salary for the said period. But the 6 months' arrears of salary and allowances which the Sen Tribunal had awarded were not paid to him in time. Suddenly, by the Bank's letter his services were terminated on the evening of the 14th November 1950 with a pay order for Rs. 386-6-6 enclosed with it. In that letter it was stated that the amount of 6 months' arrears as per Sen Tribunal Award and 3 months' salary in lieu of notice and 14 days' salary for the month of November 1950 less a sum of Rs. 560/9/6 to meet the loan account of Shri Raghwendra Pant with the Bank for which he was responsible was being paid to him in discharge of his claims. His complaint is that not only were arrears of 6 months' salary not paid to him within the time fixed viz. 25th September 1950 but the yearly increment of Rs. 6 till 14th November 1950 to which he was entitled was not paid at all though the previous Tribunal had directed that there should be continuity of service. He was also not paid bonus for the year 1947. Moreover, the Bank had no right to deduct from the amounts due to him, the sum claimed as due from Shri Raghwendra Pant for whom he never stood a surety. He prays that he should be re-instated with all arrears due from January 1948 or as an alternative and preferably a sum of Rs. 12,500 should be paid to him as compensation. His complaint further states that at his instance, the Central Government launched prosecution against the Hindustan Commercial Bank Ltd., in the Court of the Additional District Magistrate Special, Kanpur, but the same was dismissed ultimately not on merits but on the plea that the award of the Sen Tribunal was void in law.

The Bank filed their reply in which they set out various acts of Shri Hem Chandra Pant during the period of his service between July 1946 and January 1948, which were alleged to be acts of fraud, criminal breach of trust, etc. The reply admits that originally he was considered as having voluntarily vacated his post with effect from 29th January 1948, but the previous All India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes) did not agree with that view and directed that he should be re-instated in the service of the Bank. The only relevant portion of the statement of the Bank relating to his allegations with reference to what happened after he resumed duties on 4th October 1950 is found in paragraph 10 of the statement. All that is stated there is, "Later on it was found that he was surplus to the requirements of the Bank and his services were terminated by paying him 3 months' salary and dearness allowance in lieu of notice. The arrears which were to be paid to Mr. Pant in terms of the said award were also paid to him after deducting from him a sum of Rs. 560/9/6 being the amount due from him to the Bank on account of the money taken by him in the name of his brother Mr. Raygwendra Pant for which he is responsible plus up-to-date interest and expenses incurred by the Bank in filing the suit against him at Nainital". It will be noted that the Bank had not controverted his statement as to the treatment allotted to him during the period of his service between 4th November 1950, down to the date when his services were terminated. The only reason given in the Bank's reply for terminating his services is that he was surplus to the requirements of the bank. Shri Bhatnagar appearing for the Bank examined no witnesses. He stated that the services of Shri Hem Chandra Pant were terminated because first, they were surplus to the requirements of the Bank and secondly Shri Pant was inefficient. He admitted that this was not a case of dismissal as no charge-sheet was framed against him and he was not asked to show cause why he should not be dismissed from service but his services were

terminated by giving him 3 months' salary in lieu of notice. As regards the alleged inefficiency, in reply to a question from the Tribunal, he categorically admitted that the Bank has service sheets containing remarks about the efficiency or otherwise of its employees but he stated that he was not in a position to produce such service sheets relating to Shri Hem Chandra Pant. Shri Bhatnagar also admitted that he could not establish the case of Shri Hem Chandra Pant's service being surplus to the requirements of the Bank. It was stated by Shri Kaker on behalf of the employee that the principle of "last to come, first to go" was not applied at all, and that there were in the United Provinces 32 people in the service of the Bank junior to Shri Hem Chandra Pant, 6 of whom were in Kanpur itself. Shri Bhatnagar after examining the office records in his possession admitted that there were 24 people junior to Shri Pant in the United Provinces 16 of whom were in the Head Office of the Bank at Kanpur and stated that he could not sustain the order on the ground that Shri Pant's services were surplus. He frankly admitted that the only principle which the Bank chose to apply to retrench Shri Hem Chandra Pant was that the Sen Tribunal permitted the Bank to dispense with the services of any employee for no cause whatever if only the Bank gave him 3 months' notice or salary in lieu thereof. In this case they gave him 3 months' salary and got rid of him.

It follows from the above admissions on behalf of the Bank that the termination of services of Shri Hem Chandra Pant on 14th November 1950 is wholly unjustified and comes very near to flouting the orders of the Sen Tribunal. Though there was a nominal compliance by restoring him to service, in less than 2 months he was sent out summarily and for no really good cause. The attempt of the Bank in its statement filed before us to justify its first act of dismissal on 20th March 1948 is really not relevant at all to this enquiry. The Sen Tribunal gave an award directing re-instatement of Shri Hem Chandra Pant. The Bank, in compliance of that order, had restored him to service. We are now concerned with the dispute relating to the termination of his services for the second time by the order of the Bank, dated 14th November 1950. This, as already pointed out, is totally unjustified.

In view, however, of some of the allegations found in the statement of the Bank in relation to certain alleged improper acts of Shri Hem Chandra Pant prior to 1948 one of the members of this Tribunal desired that he should enter the witness box. He did so accordingly and he gave his own explanation of his acts. We cannot say his explanations are wholly convincing. It is however unnecessary to go into that matter because that relates to past transactions in respect of which he had never been charge sheeted. It is sufficient to say that the Bank was not able to justify its first order of termination of service, dated 20th March 1948, and they were compelled to re-instate him by the award of the Sen Tribunal. After having acquiesced in that order and after reinstating him, in about a month and a half they suddenly dismissed him on grounds which are not now supported before us.

The further question is what relief should be given to him in the circumstances of the case. The Sen Tribunal had ordered that he should be paid six months' pay and allowances. He has been already paid Rs. 386/8/6 being the balance due to him after deducting Rs. 560/9/6 which was stated to be due from his brother in respect of a loan for which Shri Pant was held responsible by the Bank. He was given 3 months' salary in lieu of notice. Taking all the circumstances into consideration, we think this is not a case where reinstatement is desirable. Shri Pant himself prefers to have compensation. He no doubt desires to have a very large amount. His claim for Rs. 12,300 is exorbitant. We think the ends of justice will be met by directing the Bank to pay him a further sum of Rs. 1,600 by way of compensation. We pass an award accordingly.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Subject to the note appended. (Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

#### NOTE

I am of opinion that the conduct of Shri Hemchandra Pant was such as would have ordinarily resulted in the termination of his services, more particularly as he was an employee of a credit institution. In this connection, I refer to the following two out of several charges of fraud, forgery etc., made against him, as per statement filed by the Hindustan Commercial Bank Ltd., in reply to his statement, dated 28th February, 1952.

2. (1) According to the Bank's statement a cheque for Rs. 132/2/- drawn by All Saints Diocesan College in favour of a client of the bank, named Shri Jodh

Singh, or bearer, was received by a peon of the bank for the credit of the account of the said constituent, who had an overdraft account with the bank, and the same was misappropriated by Shri H. C. Pant.

(2) The bank's statement is supported by a letter, dated 22nd January, 1952, written to the bank by All Saints Diocesan College, copy given below, that the cheque was sent to the bank in compliance with the request of Shri Jodh Singh:

'Please confirm receipt of the cheque No. 013525, dated 15th December 1947 for Rs. 132/2/- in favour of Jodh Singh Milkman, Phurpata', in compliance to his request as per his letter forwarded to me by you along with your letter No. 1660, dated 29th November, 1947.

The cheque under reference was handed over to your Chaprasi Narain Singh, who called for it in accordance with your telephonic conversation".

(3) Shri Pant admits the receipt of the cheque, which he says was meant for him in payment of an advance made by him to Messrs. Gusian Singh and Jodh Singh, who used to supply milk to him, and that he, therefore, sent the same to his bankers, M/s. Durga Shah Mohanlal Shah, Nainital, for collection and credit of his account with them. He further states that when questioned in this connection, he gave to the Manager of the Bank a copy of his letter addressed to the college authorities about the matter but could get no reply from them, as the college was closed for winter vacation.

(i) It is difficult to believe Shri Pant's story for the following reasons:—

(a) If the college authorities wanted to pay the amount to Shri Pant at the request of Shri Jodh Singh, the cheque would ordinarily have been drawn in favour of Shri Pant, and not in favour of Shri Jodh Singh.

(b) If the cheque in question was meant for Shri Pant, there is no reason why the college authorities should have asked for confirmation of the receipt of the cheque by the bank, presumably after coming to know that Shri Jodh Singh's account with the bank had not been credited with the same.

(c) If one is to believe Shri Pant's statement that after his explanation was called for in this connection he wrote to the college authorities to inform the bank that the cheque in question was actually meant for Shri Pant and not for the credit of Shri Jodh Singh's account with the bank, there is no reason why the college authorities could not have complied with his request. Shri Pant has produced no evidence in support of his statement that any such letter was written by him. Even if it is assumed that such a letter was sent by Shri Pant to the college authorities when college was closed for winter vacation, Shri Pant could have got his statement confirmed even after the re-opening of the college.

(d) Shri Pant admits that he refunded the amount of the said cheque to the Bank probably when he was threatened with prosecution, and not at the request of Shri Jodh Singh, as stated by Shri Pant.

(e) In my opinion it is highly objectionable for a bank employee to lend money to his employer bank's constituents having overdraft facilities, as in such cases the interests of the employee are bound to clash with those of his employer.

3. (1) According to the statement of the bank, Shri Pant got a loan of Rs. 700 from the bank in November 1946 in the name of his brother, Shri Raghwendra Pant, by forging the signature of his brother on the Demand Pronote. Although no evidence has been produced before the Tribunal by the bank in support of the said allegation, Shri Pant's own statement in this connection is not at all convincing.

(2) Shri Hemchandra Pant admits having received the amount on behalf of his brother, but states that the amount was returned to the Manager of the Bank without getting any acknowledgment from him. He appears not to have even enquired why the amount received by him on behalf of his brother was to be handed back to the Manager of the Bank. In answer to a question put by me to Shri Pant at the time of his examination by the Tribunal, whether he had ever informed his brother about it, he replied in the negative. He further stated that he had even no knowledge of his brother's whereabouts. It is most surprising that Shri H. C. Pant did not think it necessary to bring the matter to the notice of his brother, as the amount involved in the transaction was a fairly large one for persons of the means of the two brothers.

(3) According to the Bank's statement Shri Pant consented to pay the amount of this loan to the bank by monthly instalment of Rs. 15, which amount was paid for some time, after which the payment of further instalments was discontinued. It is true that the bank has not produced any evidence in support of the above statement, but Shri Pant has nowhere contradicted it either. On the other hand the bank's statement that the amount of his loan had been reduced to Rs. 450 supports the view expressed above. The fact that only a sum of Rs. 560/9/6 which included interest and expenses incurred by the bank in filing a suit against his brother, Shri Raghwendra Pant, was deducted from the amount payable to Shri H. C. Pant under the Sen Award, clearly shows that somehow or other a part adjustment of this account had taken place, for which no explanation is forthcoming from him. If any amount towards part payment of the said loan had been made by his brother, Shri Raghwendra Pant, Shri H. C. Pant could easily have got the information from his brother and contradicted the bank's statement in this connection.

4. I know that in a criminal case it is necessary to have the guilt of an accused brought home to him by satisfactory evidence in support of the charges levelled against him. However, the position in case of the termination of the services of an employee, particularly that of a credit institution like a bank, is, in my opinion, entirely different. If the authorities of a bank have reasonable grounds to suspect the integrity of an employee, they will, I think, be justified in terminating his services after charge-sheeting him.

5. In spite of what is stated above, and the fact that Shri Pant not only has not produced any evidence whatsoever in support of his allegation that the bank wanted to get rid of his services, on account of his trade union activities, but has not even in his own examination by the Tribunal referred to it. I am unable to justify the manner in which the management of the bank terminated his services. The authorities of the bank should have properly charge-sheeted the employee and after giving due consideration to his written explanation, could have put an end to his services in the Bank. On the other hand they gave flimsy excuses while terminating Shri Pant's services. I therefore agree with the view of my colleagues that Shri Hem Chandra Pant should be compensated by the bank by payment of Rs. 1,600 to him.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

BOMBAY;  
Dated the 21st June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri Jadoram Dubey

*Versus*

The Eastern Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification S.R.O. No. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serials No. 2. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

"DISCHARGE FROM SERVICE".

A notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was filed by the workman within the time allowed but the Bank, however, in their letter, dated 18th February 1952, have written to us as follows:

"We are in receipt of your letter No. 820, of the 12th February relative to the above. We have to advise that in accordance with the directions

contained in the Ministry of Labour, Notification No. L.R.2(268)I, dated the 17th January 1950, Mr. Jadoram Dubay's termination of service has been treated as retirement and all retiral benefits have been paid to him. In view of this we consider the case as being settled and do not therefore seek further adjudication in the matter".

In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 27th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri P. N. Tholasingam Mudaliar

*Versus*

The Eastern Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 410. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"DISMISSAL FROM SERVICE"**

A notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. Even though no statement was filed by the concerned workman within the time allowed, the Bank sent their reply, as according to them the workman sent an unsigned copy of what was supposed to be his statement of claim. But in the absence of a regular statement from the workman it is not necessary for us to consider the reply.

In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that there is no dispute at present, to be decided. We accordingly pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 27th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri Sirajul Haq

*Versus*

Habib Bank Limited.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It

appears there as Serial No. 295. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows.

**"TERMINATION OF SERVICE".**

A notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:-

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 10th March 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank, but no statement was filed by the workman within the time allowed. However, the Bank have written to us, in their letter, dated 3rd March 1952, as follows:-

"With reference to your letter No. 1677 of 22nd February, 1952, we have to inform you that the above case was settled before the All India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes), Calcutta, by us and the U.P. Bank Employees Union, Kanpur, as per copy of letter and copy of the full and final settlement receipt signed by Shri Sirajul Haq enclosed herewith for your information. At present there is no dispute in this matter".

In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 27th June, 1952.

**BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES).**  
**BOMBAY**

Shri Motiram Gupta

*Versus*

Bank of Bikaner.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 279. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"DISMISSAL FROM SERVICE"**

A notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 10th March 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice which was sent to the bank was also duly served on them. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed. The Bank also in their letter, dated 15th March 1952, have written to us to say that they have not received any

copy of any statement from the workman. In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;  
Dated the 27th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES)  
BOMBAY

Shri Amarnath Sharma

*Versus*

Bank of Bikaner.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 278. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:-

**"TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT"**

A notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

The notice was duly served on the individual. A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The receipt of the notice is acknowledged by the Bank in their letter, dated 7th March 1952. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed.

In the letter aforesaid the Bank says that the decision given by the Sen Tribunal in this matter has already been fully implemented by them and that the workman concerned has been reinstated in the service of the Bank and paid due compensation as directed therein and that he continues to be an employee at their Delhi Branch. The absence of any statement from the workman also leads us to the inference that the matter must have been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. In these circumstances we pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;  
Dated the 27th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES)  
BOMBAY

Shri Gobinda Chandra De

*Versus*

Chartered Bank of India, Australia and China.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 1. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:-

**"DISCHARGE FROM SERVICE"**

A notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:-

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the individual and the Bank. No statement has been received from the workman within the time allowed. Subsequently the workman also has, by his letter, dated 27th February 1952, written to us to say that his former dispute with the bank no longer exists.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 27th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri Nilendra Chandra Dutt

*Versus*

Bengal Central Bank.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 31. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows

**"DISCHARGE FROM SERVICE".**

Notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the individual and the Bank. No statement has been received from the workman within the time allowed. The workman also has however by his letter, dated 21st February 1952, written to us to say that the dispute in question has been settled.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri Jiyalal Sharma

*Versus*

Allahabad Bank Ltd.

These disputes between Shri Sharma and the Allahabad Bank Ltd. have been referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. They appear there as Serial Nos. 40 and 107. The nature of the disputes as set out is as follows:—

“DISCHARGE FROM SERVICE”—(Serial No. 40)

“REDUCTION IN GRADE”—(Serial No. 107)

Notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

“You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal”.

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the individual and the Bank. No statement has been received from the workman within the time allowed.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that on orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY,

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri Vishwanath Upadhyaya

*Versus*

Allahabad Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 106. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

“REDUCTION IN GRADE”

Notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

“You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal”.

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the individual and the Bank. No statement has been received from the workman within the time allowed. The workman has however by his letter, dated 26th February 1952, written to us to say that there "exists no case" between him and the Bank.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY,

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri S. N. Nath

*Versus*

The Bank of Behar.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 275. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

"NON-CONFIRMATION IN SERVICE AND WITHHOLDING OF INCREMENT".

Notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the individual and the Bank. No statement has been received from the workman within the time allowed. Subsequently the workman also has by his letter, dated 4th March 1952, written to us to say that he does not desire any fresh adjudication on the above issues.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY,

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri Kumar Farash

*Versus*

Central Bank of India.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952.

It appears there as Serial No. 289. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"GRANT OF COMPENSATORY LEAVE"**

Notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by registered post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the individual and the Bank. No statement has been received from the workman within the time allowed. Subsequently the workman also has by his letter (undated) written to us to say that all his demands have been fulfilled and that the dispute does not exist now.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY,

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

**BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES).**  
**BOMBAY**

Shri Kamta Prasad Rahotgi

*Versus*

Hindustan Commercial Bank.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 299. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"TRANSFER FROM ONE BRANCH TO ANOTHER"**

Notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by registered post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 6th March 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the individual and the Bank. No statement has been received from the workman within the time allowed. Subsequently the workman has also by his letter, dated 22nd February 1952, written to us to say that his case has been amicably settled by the bank.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY,

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

## BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),

Shri M. L. Verma

Versus

Central Bank of India Ltd., Aligarh.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 322. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

## "REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS"

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter, dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end".

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:—

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary organisation which represents all the employees of all the banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature viz. 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification S.R.O. No. 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY,  
Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri S. N. Shukla.

Versus

Central Bank of India Ltd., Aligarh.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952.

It appears there as Serial No. 323. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter, dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end".

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary organisation which represents all the employees of all the banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature *viz.* 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification S.R.O. No. 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY,

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri B. N. Mishra

*Versus*

Central Bank of India Ltd., Aligarh.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 324. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter, dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end".

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary organisation which represents all the employees of all the banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature viz. 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification S.R.O. No. 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri B. B. L. Varshney.

*Versus*

Central Bank of India Ltd., Aligarh.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 325. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:-

"REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS"

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter, dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end".

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary organisation which represents all the employees of all the banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature viz. 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification S.R.O. No. 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri B. N. Saxena

*Versus*

Central Bank of India Ltd., Aligarh.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 326. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union

through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter, dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end"

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary organisation which represents all the employees of all the banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature viz. 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification No. S.R.O. 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri N. C. Jain

*versus*

Central Bank of India Ltd., Allahabad.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 327. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS"**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter, dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end"

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary organisation which represents all the employees of all the Banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature viz 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification S.R.O. No. 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri D. P. Sharma  
*Versus*

Central Bank of India Ltd., Aligarh.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 328. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

"REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS"

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end".

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the Workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary

organisation which represents all the employees of all the banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature *viz.* 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification S. R. O. No 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri G. D. Bhatt  
*Versus*

Central Bank of India Ltd., Aligarh.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 329. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

"REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS".

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end".

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary organisation which represents all the employees of all the banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature viz. 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification No. S. R. O. 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri J. P. Sharma

*Versus*

Central Bank of India Ltd., Aligarh.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42 dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 330. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

"REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS".

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end".

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:—

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary organisation which represents all the employees of all the banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature viz. 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification S. R. O. No. 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no

dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri Nathu Ram Sharma

*Versus*

Central Bank of India Ltd., Aligarh.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India Ministry of Labour Notification No. S.R.O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 331. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workmen within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end."

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary organisation which represents all the employees of all the banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature *viz.* 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification S. R. O. No. 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member.*

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member.*

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri U. S. Choubey

*Versus*

Central Bank of India Ltd., Aligarh.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S. R. O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 332. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"REDUCTION IN INCREMENTS".**

A notice containing *inter alia* the following terms was sent by Registered Post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the concerned workman and the Bank. No statement was received from the workman within the time allowed but the U. P. Bank Employees Union through its Secretary wrote to the Tribunal in its letter dated 21st February 1952 as follows:

"We have been authorised jointly by all the concerned employees of the local Central Bank of India Ltd. that they do not wish to press their above claim. Therefore, the above case may be dropped at your end".

The Tribunal replied to this letter on 1st March 1952 asking the Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen that they should write to the Tribunal directly if they did not wish to press the claim. The Secretary of the Union, in his letter dated 4th March 1952, sent a further reply as follows:

"With reference to your letter No. 1750 of the 1st inst., we respectfully inform you that the U. P. Bank Employees Union is a solitary organisation which represents all the employees of all the banks working in Uttar Pradesh. As we have been representing all such employees before Tribunals, we think that it was convenient to write one letter from the Union on their behalf. We represent them and therefore there is no need for individual advices. Moreover, the employees had authorised us and there is no one to challenge our statement. Hence, we are sure that you shall close the matter here".

There are 11 such cases of workmen who are interested in disputes of this nature *viz.* 'Reduction of increments' being Serial Nos. 322 to 332 in the schedule to the Notification S. R. O. No. 42 aforesaid. None of them have chosen to file any statement. In these circumstances the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary in any of these cases.

(Sd) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman,

(Sd) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY,

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri Kushal Chand Taneja

*Versus*

Central Bank of India Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S. R. O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It

appears there as Serial No. 333. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"REFUND OF SECURITY DEPOSIT, PROVIDENT FUND AMOUNT".**

Notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by registered post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 15th March 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the individual and the Bank. No statement has been received from the workman within the time allowed. Subsequently the workman also has by his letter dated 6th March 1952 written to us to say that the amount was paid to him by the bank according to the last award by the All India Industrial Tribunal.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman*,  
 (Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member*.  
 (Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member*.

BOMBAY,

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

**BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
 BOMBAY**

Shri B. G. Bhattacharya

*versus*

United Commercial Bank.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S. R. O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 371. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT"**

Notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by registered post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the individual and the Bank. No statement has been received from the workman within the time allowed. Subsequently the workman also has by his letter dated 9th March 1952 written to us to say that he has been reinstated and that he has no grievances against his employers.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman*,

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member*.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member*.

BOMBAY,

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri Kartick Chandra Dutta

*Versus*

Chartered Bank of India, Australia & China.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S. R. O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears there as Serial No. 382. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"STOPPAGE OF PROMOTION"**

Notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by registered post to the concerned workman.

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal"

The notice to the individual was returned unserved but a copy of the notice which was sent to the Bank was duly served on them.

The Tribunal wrote to the Bank on 10th May 1952 requesting them to furnish this office with the present address of the individual. Subsequently both the Bank and the individual by their letters dated 15th May, 1952 and 14th May, 1952 respectively have written to say that the dispute no longer exists.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman*,

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member*.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member*.

BOMBAY;

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),  
BOMBAY

Shri Ashoka Ratan Ganguly

*Versus*

Bengal Central Bank.

This is one of the disputes referred to us for adjudication under Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Notification No. S. R. O. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It

appears there as Serial No. 396. The nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

**"PROMOTION TO JUNIOR OFFICER'S RANK"**

Notice containing, *inter alia*, the following terms was sent by registered post to the concerned workman:

"You are hereby required to inform the Tribunal in writing whether the above dispute still exists and you desire an adjudication thereof.

If you seek adjudication, you are hereby required to file a statement of your case with particulars thereof (in five copies) so as to reach this office on or before 29th February 1952 and also send another copy of the same to the Head Office of the Bank to reach them by the date mentioned above and to inform this office that this has been done.

If the statement of your case is not received in this office by the date fixed it will be taken that you have no dispute to be adjudicated by this Tribunal".

A copy of the notice was also sent to the Bank. The notice was duly served both on the individual and the Bank. No statement has been received from the workman within the time allowed. Subsequently the workman also has, by his letter dated 26th February 1952, written to us to say that there is at present no dispute between him and the bank.

In these circumstances, the only proper inference to be drawn is that the matter has been adjusted between the parties and that at present there is no dispute to be decided. We therefore pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCIAPAGESA SASTRY, Chairman.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, Member.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, Member.

BOMBAY,

Dated the 16th June, 1952.

[No. LR-100(30)]

N. C. KUPPUSWAMI, Under Secy.